Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

AUG 3 0 1994

In the Matter of)	to the wife built 经 的复数形式
)	
Amendment of the)	Gen Docket No. 90-314
Commission's Rules to)	
Establish New Personal)	
Communications Services)	DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

SPRINT CORPORATION'S OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Sprint Corporation ("Sprint"), on behalf of the United and Central Telephone companies, Sprint Communications Co., L.P., and Sprint Cellular, hereby files comments on the Petition For Further Reconsideration and Request For Clarification of ArrayComm and SCI, to the Memorandum Opinion and Order ("the order" or "the decision").1

In their petition, SCI and its parent company ArrayComm (developers of SDMA technology based on directional antennas) claim that their joint comments in the above docket were not considered in the Commission's decision to revise PCS power limits, and furthermore that the decision "may, in fact, inadvertently discourage use of such antennas."²

No. of Copies rec'd_ List ABCDE

^{1. &}lt;u>In the Matter of Amendment of the Commission's Rules to Establish New Personal Communications Services</u>, GEN Docket No. 90-314, <u>Memorandum Opinion and Order</u>, FCC 94-144, released June 13, 1994 ("<u>Memorandum Opinion And Order</u>").

^{2.} SCI/ArrayComm Petition, p. 5.

Petitioners appear to believe that the Commission's increase in base station power limits up to 1640 watts e.i.r.p. and imposition of a 100 watt e.r.p. limit on base station transmitters will put their directional or "smart" antenna technology at a competitive disadvantage in the PCS marketplace. However, the petition does not adequately explain or substantiate these assertions. Nor does Sprint know of any corroborative evidence.

Petitioners claim that the establishment of power limits in terms of watts per channel, rather than watts per hertz "encourages the use of narrower channels and therefore favors the use of narrowband RF channels over wide-band channels..."

Petitioners further claim that the 100 watts per channel transmitter limit, combined with directional antenna technology, will "preclude large coverage areas by restricting the 'broadcast' control channels...."

They seek clarification that the limits apply to individual base station transmitters, regardless of the number of transmitters per base station, the antenna elements to which transmitters are connected, or the channels in which each transmitter may operate.

Sprint believes that the concern expressed in their petition over the measurement of power in watts per channel is unfounded. For one thing, Petitioners' complaint that the watts

^{3. &}lt;u>Id</u>.

^{4. &}lt;u>Id</u>., p. 6

per channel measurement favors narrowband over wideband deployment is inconsistent with ArrayComm's own previous position statement that SDMA technology is adaptable to all modulation formats -- including narrowband (AMPS, NAMPS) as well as wideband (TDMA, CDMA).⁵

In addition, Sprint does not believe that a limitation based on watts per channel is in itself a hindrance to the development of SDMA or any other technology, since many other factors must be weighed in selecting a technology for a particular service -- such as bits per frame, codec rate, etc. Sprint believes that the PCS service provider will select the technology for the service provided within the guidelines established in the order. Sprint does not believe that these guidelines unfairly disadvantage SDMA or any other technology; on the contrary Sprint believes they are broad enough to encompass the parameters of both "smart" and omnidirectional antennas, and will encourage competition in the deployment of PCS technologies.

Sprint urges the Commission to uphold the PCS power limits of 1640 e.i.r.p. for base stations and 100 watts e.r.p. for base station transmitters. Sprint welcomes the SDMA smart antenna concept as one of an array of promising antenna technologies. However, we do not believe that Petitioners have

^{5. &}quot;SDMA Technology for Personal Communications Services" presented by ArrayComm at JTC, 1-5 November 1993, Phoenix, AZ, p. 3.

presented any convincing evidence that this technology suffers a competitive disadvantage under the Commission's current PCS power limits.

Respectfully submitted,

SPRINT CORPORATION

y dy [. le

Leon Kestenbaum
1850 M Street, N.W.

Suite 1100

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 857-1030

Kevin Gallagher 8725 Higgins Road Chicago, IL 60631 (312) 399-2348

Its Attorneys

August 30, 1994

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Melinda L. Mills, hereby certify that I have on this 30th day of August, 1994, sent via U.S. First Class Mail, postage prepaid, or Hand Delivery, a copy of the foregoing "Sprint Corporation's Opposition to Petition for Reconsideration" in the Matter of Amendment of the Commission's Rules to Establish New Personal Communications Services, Gen Docket No. 90-314 filed this date with the Acting Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, to the persons on the attached service list.

Melinda L. Mills

Jonathan D. Blake
Robert A. Long, Jr.
John F. Duffy
COVINGTON & BURLING
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
PO Box 7566
Washington, DC 20044
Counsel for American Personal
Communications

John Hearne, Chairman Point Communications Group 100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1000 Santa Monica, CA 90401

Michael F. Altschul Cellular Telecommunications Industry Assoc. 1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW Suite 200 Washington, DC 20036

Philip L. Verveer
Laurence D. Atlas
Jennifer A. Donaldson
WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER
Three Lafayette Centre
1155 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036-3384
Counsel for CTIA

Mark Golden Personal Communications Industry Assoc. 1019 19th Street, NW Suite 1100 Washington, DC 20036 Mark J. Tauber
Mark J. O'Connor
PIPER & MARBURY
1200 19th Street, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, DC 20036
Counsel for OMNIPOINT Corp.

Leonard J. Kennedy Richard S. Denning DOW, LOHNES & ALBERTSON 1255 23rd Street, NW Washington, DC 20037 Counsel for Comcast Corp. Julian L. Shepard Assoc. for Maximum Service Television, Inc. 1776 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20036

Sam Antar Capital Cities/ABC, Inc. 77 West 66th Street 16th Floor New York, NY 10023 Mark W. Johnson CBS Inc. 1634 I Street, NW Washington, DC 20006 Molly Pauker Fox, Inc. & Fox Television Stations, Inc. 5151 Wisconsin Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20016 Henry L. Baumann National Association of Broadcasters 1771 N Street, NW Washington, DC 20036

John K. Hane, III National Broadcasting Company, Inc. 1229 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW 11th Floor Washington, DC 20004 J. Laurent Scharff REED SMITH SHAW & MCCLAY 1200 18th Street, NW Washington, DC 20036

Charles W. Kelly, Jr.
Society of Broadcast Engineers
8445 Keystone Crossing
Suite 140
Indianapolis, IN 46240

Howard N. Miller Public Broadcasting Service 1320 Braddock Place Alexandria, VA 22314

William J. Franklin
WILLIAM J. FRANKLIN, CHTD.
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006-3404
Counsel for Association of Independent
Designated Entities

Joe D. Edge
Sue W. Bladek
Mark F. Dever
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH
901 Fifteenth Street, NW
Suite 900
Washington, DC 20005
Counsel for Puerto Rico Telephone Co.

Jill Abeshouse Stern
SHAW, PITTMAN, POTTS & TROWBRIDGE
2300 N Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037
Counsel for Spatial Communications, Inc.;
Arraycomm, Inc.

Richard Engelman*
Office of Engineering and Technology
Federal Communications Commission
2025 M Street, NW, Room 7122-B
Washington, DC 20554

Kathleen Wallman, Chief*
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW, Room 500
Washington, DC 20554

Greg Vogt, Chief*
Tariff Division
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW, Room 518
Washington, DC 20554

ITS* 1919 M Street, NW, Room 246 Washington, DC 20554 Joel Ader*
Bellcore
2101 L Street, NW, 6th Floor
Washington, DC 20037

* indicates Hand Delivery